

# Fax Cover Sheet

U.S. Patent & Trademark Office



Art Unit 2671

Date: 5/8/02

To:

Name: Justin

Company: 09/369,281 (Att. Docket 00169-00013.1)

Phone No: \_\_\_\_\_

Fax No: (202) 530 1055

From:

Name: Phu Nguyen

Phone No: (703) 305 9796

Fax No: (703) 308 5359

Number of pages (including this cover sheet): \_\_\_\_\_

If you have not received all of the pages of this transmission, please contact me.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/369,281

Applicant(s)  
SILVERBROOK

Examiner  
Phu K. Nguyen

Art Unit  
2671



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 27, 2002

2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 84-93 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 84-93 is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirements.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:

- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

20) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

*Phu K. Nguyen*  
PHU K. NGUYEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 8400

Art Unit: 2671

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 84-93 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-88 of U. S. Patent No. 6,020,894 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: The compressed image is stored as a plurality of bands in which multiple passes over the bands are used to manipulate the image.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2671

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 84-93 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Bantz et al. (US 4,679,038) in view of Lotspiech (4,271,467).

As per claim 1, Band teaches the "method of creating an image" comprising the step of multiple passing the bands to manipulate the image (Bantz, figure 1). It is noted that Bantz does not explicitly teach that the data stored in the bands are "independently compressed" as claimed. However, Bantz' bitmap memory 102 which stores the image bands suggests any step to efficiently store the image in the bitmap memory can be used such as compression for efficiently utilizing the memory space. Furthermore, Lotspiech teaches that storing the image in compressed form to reduce the required memory is well known in the art (see Lotspiech, column 4, lines 40-54). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, in view of the teaching of Lotspiech, to configure Bantz' method as claimed by compressing the stored data before load them into the memory to save the memory.

Claim 85 adds into claim 84 the step of compressing and editing the stored image which are well known in a computer graphic system such as Bantz.

Due to the similarity of claims 86-93 to claims 84-85 they are rejected under a similar reason.

Accordingly, the claimed invention as represented in the claims does not represent a patentable distinction over the art of record.

Art Unit: 2671

***Conclusion***

4. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703)-308-9051 (**formal** communications intended for entry), Or:

(703)-305-9724 (**informal** communications labeled **PROPOSED** or **DRAFT**).

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Sixth Floor Receptionist, Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA.


5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phu K. Nguyen, whose telephone number is (703)-305-9796 and can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 6:30 AM to 3 PM.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Phu K. Nguyen

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2671

  
PHU K. NGUYEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 2400